REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R.§ 1.83(a) indicating that the plastic material claimed in Claim 12 must be shown by proper cross hatching or the feature be cancelled from the claim. The Applicant herewith submits a replacement Figure 1 with the appropriate hatching to indicate that one embodiment of the claimed invention comprises plastic material.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R.§ 1.84 (p)(5) for failing to include the reference characters 120 and 264 which are not mentioned in the description. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting this discrepancy and herewith amends paragraphs 33 and 36 to include references and appropriate description to the reference characters 120 and 264 as indicated on the drawings.

The Examiner also objected to the disclosure because of the informality of lacking brief description of Figures 9A, 9B, 10A, or 10B. The Applicant again thanks the Examiner for noting this discrepancy and hereby amends the brief description of the drawings at paragraphs 22 and 23 to indicate that the Figures 9A and 9B as well as 10A and 10B show embodiments of the container wherein projecting an recessed elements of engagement elements are adjacent and spaced apart respectively.

The Examiner also rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C.§ 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention by failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation of "the center" in line 2 of Claim 10. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting this discrepancy and hereby amends Claim 10 to recite that "the engagement elements are approximately formed in a center of each container" (Claim 10 as currently amended).

The Examiner also rejects claims 1-5, 9, 11, and 15 under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meurer et al. in view of Rainey et al. The Applicant has carefully reviewed the Meurer et al. '389 and Rainey et al. '783 references and notes that Meurer et al. '389 discloses a dispensing container for nose and throat preparations having a pair of cooperating containers 10 and 11 described as duplicates of each other. The containers 10 and 11 are joined by four lugs 44 on the outer center face of the container 10A which are detachably and frictionally received in registering slots 46 in container 11A (cf Figure 4 in column 3 lines 55-57). Alternatively, Meurer

et al. '389 discloses that the containers 10B and 11B can be joined by cooperating shoulders 46' on the vertical sides of container 11B which are slidably and frictionally received in registering grooves 48 on the vertical sides of container 10B. The Applicant respectfully notes however, that Meurer et al. '389 fails to disclose or suggest the features of "A dosing dispenser for dosing at least two components, wherein the dosing dispenser has a reservoir with at least two containers, which can be combined to form the reservoir and each of which can receive one component wherein each container has at least one engagement element at least in the area facing the bottom side of the container, the at least one engagement element comprising at least one projecting element and at least one corresponding recessed element wherein the recessed element comprises an insertion area that has sloped walls and wherein the projecting element and the corresponding recessed element comprise undercut contours wherein the containers can be combined to form the reservoir by inserting the projecting elements of each container into the insertion area and sliding the projecting elements into engagement with the recessed elements of the respective other container." (Claim 1 as currently amended). Similar additional limitations are made by this paper to Claim 2.

The Applicant further respectfully notes that Rainey et al. '783 teaches a dual container having two chambers secured together. The attachment of the two chambers are described as preferably consisting of hot melts between the two chambers. However Rainey et al. '783 also discloses a mechanical coupling between the two chambers as illustrated in Figures 4A and 4B and described as including proximal walls 30 and 30' which include ridges or wedges 36, 36' which extend generally vertically along one side of each of the proximal walls. These ridges assist in positioning the chambers so that they are offset. In addition, proximal wall 30 of a chamber preferably includes raised areas and recesses such as vertically extending trough 33. Proximal wall 30' likewise preferably includes secondary ridge 32 and trough 33. Ridges 32, 32' receive troughs 33, 33' when the chambers are joined back to back along the proximal walls. The Applicant notes that Rainey et al. '783 also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed aspect "wherein the recessed element comprises an insertion area that has sloped walls and wherein the projecting element and the corresponding recessed element comprise undercut contours wherein the containers can be combined to form the reservoir by inserting the projecting elements of each container into the insertion area and sliding the projecting elements into engagement with the

recessed elements of the respective other container."(Claim 1 as currently amended). Again, similar further limitations are added to Claim 2 by this paper.

Thus the Applicant notes that neither Meurer et al. '389 or Rainey et al. '783 disclose or suggest the claimed aspects of an insertion area and recessed and projecting elements having an undercut contour such that the containers are joined together by inserting the projecting elements of each container into the insertion area of the respective other container and sliding the projecting elements into engagement with the respect elements so as to interconnect the multiple containers. Thus the Applicant believes that Claim 1 and 2 as currently amended are patentable under the requirements of 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) over the disclosures of Meurer et al. '389 in view of Rainey et al. '783. The Applicant also believes that Claims 4-6 and 8-15 depending from Claim 2 properly further define the claimed invention and are also patentable over the disclosures of Meurer et al. '389 and Rainey et al. '783.

The Examiner also rejects Claims 5, 6, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meurer et al. in view of Rainey et al. and further in view of Brown Jr. '426. The Applicant has carefully reviewed the Brown Jr. '426 reference and notes that Brown Jr. discloses a system of laterally interlocked containers where each container has a tenon or dovetail 34 which mates with a cooperating mortis 36 which in cross section is similar in shape to dovetail 34 and slightly larger in size in order to receive dovetail 34 of an adjacent container. By engaging the dovetail 34 of a container 39 with the mortis 36 of a container 38 and sliding the containers 38 and 39 longitudinally with respect to each other until a flush position is reached, the containers are joined (CF column 2 lines 19-23 and 38-42). Brown Jr. '426 teaches further embodiments wherein the mating structures of the containers are configured as dowels 40 and 41 and circular grooves 42 and 43 or as tongues of T cross section 44 and 45 and corresponding grooves 46 and 47. However, Brown Jr. '426 clearly fails to teach or suggest "recessed elements comprising an insertion area that has sloped walls...wherein the containers can be combined to form the reservoir by inserting the projecting elements of each container into the insertion area and sliding the projecting elements into engagement with the recessed elements of the respective other container"(Claim 1 as currently amended. Similar changes made to Claim 2). Thus the Applicant believes that Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8-15 are also patentable over the combined

disclosures of Meurer et al. '389 in view of Rainey et al. '783 and further in view of Brown Jr. '426.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over the previously cited references further in the view of Schwartz '841. The Applicant notes that Claim 7 is cancelled by this paper. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that structure 15 of Schwartz teaches an insertion area. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiners interpretation of the discloser of Schwartz and notes that the structure 15 of Schwartz is described as a male portion comprising a curved protrusion 15 which extends from and is part of the large container 2. Curved protrusion 15 is seen inserted into corresponding recess 20. Protrusion 15 comprises a curved surface 50 and a straight surface 51, the surfaces 50 and 51 intersecting at an acute angle. Protrusion 15 overhangs the tapered flange 17 in such a manner that if force is applied in the horizontal direction in Figure 4, the plastic containers will tend not to be pulled apart. Thus, the Applicant believes that Schwartz '841 discloses the curved protrusion 15 to be a male configured structure which cooperates with a corresponding female contoured structure in a mating container which cooperate to resist separation of the containers once joined. The protrusion 15 is clearly not an insertion area where projecting elements of a container can be inserted into the insertion area and then slid into engagement with the recessed elements of the respective other container as in the Applicants claimed invention as amended by this paper. Thus the Applicant believes that Claim 8 is patentable over the teachings of Meurer et al. '389 in view of Rainey et al. '783 in further view of Brown Jr. '426 and further in view of Schwartz '841.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over the previously cited references as applied to Claim 2 above and further in the view of Sparling '565. The Applicant has carefully reviewed the Sparling '565 reference and notes that Sparling discloses an interconnectable beverage container system including a plurality of individual containers 10 which can be coupled or interconnected by cooperating female longitudinal connecting members 24 and male longitudinal connecting members 26. The Applicant respectfully notes that Sparling '565 also clearly fails to disclose or suggest the claimed aspects of "wherein the recessed element comprises an insertion area...wherein the containers can be combined to form the reservoir by inserting the projecting elements of each

container into the insertion area and sliding the projecting elements into engagement with the recessed elements of the respective other container"(Claim 1 as currently amended, similar changes made to Claim 2). Instead, Sparling '565 is of a similar construction to the Brown Jr. '426 devices which require that the female longitudinal connecting members 24 be engaged with cooperating male longitudinal connecting members 26 and the respecting containers 10 moved longitudinally with respect to each other to form the interconnection there between. Thus the Applicant believes that the combined disclosures of Meurer et al. '389 in view of Rainey et al. '783 in further view of Brown Jr. '426 in further view of Schwartz '841 and yet further in view of Sparling '565 still fail to disclose or suggest the claimed aspects of the Applicants invention as amended by this paper. The Applicant believes that Claims 10 and 12 properly further define and depend from the independent Claim 2 and are thus patentable under the requirements of 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) over the cited references as dependent upon Claim 2 as amended by this paper.

SUMMARY

Thus from the foregoing, the Applicant believes that this paper with the replacement drawing is fully responsive to the objections raised by the Examiner in the Office Action. The Applicant further believes that the claims as currently amended comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C.§ 112, second paragraph and do particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. As described above, the Applicant believes that the claims as currently amended are also patentable under the requirements of 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) over the disclosures of Meurer et al. '389, Rainey et al. '783, Brown Jr. '426, Schwartz '841 and Sparling '565 taken independently or in any possible combination. Thus the Applicant believes that the subject application is in a condition ready for allowance and respectfully requests prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability. The Applicant believes that this paper is fully responsive to the objections and rejections made by the Examiner in the Office Action, however should there remain any further impediment to the allowance of this application that might be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the Applicants undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 4/13/05

By: _____

James W. Ausley
Registration No. 49,076
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(951) 781-9231

1606840:hvd
041205

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please amend the drawings as follows:

Enclosed is a replacement Fig. 1 which the Applicant believes satisfactorily addresses the Examiner's objections under 37 C.F.R.§ 1.83(a). One (1) sheet of **Replacement Drawings** is attached at the end of this paper.